

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

DE KROON et al

Atty. Ref.: **4662-254**

Serial No. **10/511,344**

Group: **1711**

Filed: **May 23, 2005**

Examiner: **Haider**

For: **MULTILAYER BLOWN FILM AND PROCESS FOR PRODUCTION THEREOF**

* * * * *

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

DECLARATION UNDER RULE 132

Sir:

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.132, the undersigned, **Ted BRINK**, hereby declares and states that:

1. I am presently and for all times relevant to the facts stated herein have been employed by DSM N.V. at its facility in Geleen, The Netherlands.
2. I am a named inventor of, and am thereby familiar with, the invention disclosed and claimed in U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/511,344 filed on May 23, 2005, entitled "MULTILAYER BLOWN FILM AND PROCESS FOR PRODUCTION THEREOF" (hereinafter "the '344 application").
3. I am therefore familiar with the experimental evidence presented originally in the '344 application, particularly Examples I through III and Comparative Experiments A and B as reported on pages 6 and 7 of the '344 application. As to such experimental evidence, I offer the following

additional comments and observations based on my personal experiences when such experimental evidence was created:

Comparative Experiment A and Example I

The bubble stability in Example I where the polyamide (PA) layer is the branched polyamide-6 (PA6) has a better bubble stability than Comparative Experiment A where the inner layer is the standard linear (non-branched) PA6. The bubble stability was determined visually by observing the degree of vibrations of the film. My observations were that the blow moulded multilayer film of Example I clearly exhibited significantly higher bubble stability with a lower degree of vibration during blow-moulding as compared to Comparative Experiment A.

Comparative Experiment B

In this comparative experiment, the process of Comparative Experiment A was repeated, except that 30 wt.% LDPE in the outer layer of PE mixture was replaced with LLDPE so that the PE layer was formed of a mixture of 90 wt.% LLDPE and 10wt.% Yparex OH040. It was clear from visual inspection that such a change had a strong influence on the bubble stability. Specifically, replacing 30wt% LDPE with LLDPE so that the PE layer had 90 wt% LLDPE (instead of 60wt% LLDPE) made it impossible to control the blow-moulding process in such a way as to obtain a bubble with sufficient stability. It was observed in this regard that strong bubble vibrations occurred when the multilayer film of Comparative Experiment B was blow-moulded resulting in frequent bubble collapse.

Example II and III

This experimental evidence was obtained under the same conditions as Comparative Experiment B, except the linear PA6 was replaced with the branched PA6 employed in Example I. When blow-moulded, the bubble remained stable. The good stability of the bubble was also confirmed by the fact that it was possible to increase the blow-up ratio from 2.1 to 2.5.

4. I declare further that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.

Respectfully Submitted,

March 15, 2008

Date Signed


Ted BRINK